



## **MEETING SUMMARY**

### **TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE KIRKLAND CITY HALL, KIRKLAND, WA APRIL 25, 2001 — 1:00 – 3:30 P.M.**

#### **INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, welcomed the committee members and reviewed the agenda. The purpose of the day's meeting was to review information on the proposed TDM package. The committee was also to make recommendations to the lead agencies regarding the proposed multi-modal alternatives to be carried into second level screening. No changes were made to the agenda.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Hansen, from Canterbury Shores Condominium Association just south of the SR 520 bridge near the Washington Arboretum, made a statement of opposition against any proposed expansion of the SR 520 bridge because: 1) bridge traffic would increase and resulting noise would increase; 2) pollutant run off into the lake would increase; 3) exit roads on the west side of the lake cannot handle increased traffic, and congested traffic would mean increased local air pollution; 4) the increased size of the bridge would result in view degradation and decreased property values.

Omar Fulton, from AMEC/SubTerra, introduced to the committee a working group of local engineering and tunneling professionals who are dedicated to underground construction. He introduced the group to the Trans-Lake Project because members are interested in pursuing a submerged floating tunnel.

Daniel Bray of Bellevue submitted a letter regarding the seismic risk/vulnerability of the SR-520 corridor. He mentioned the seismic risk involved with locating a bridge in the Madison Park area. That is one of the earthquake sensitive areas as shown by seismometers placed for the Kingdome implosion.

Henry Paulman of T.R.U.S.T. urged the committee to bring back the north crossing for consideration. It was originally supported as a way to increase capacity of regional infrastructure, and it also was supported by data from the origin-destination study of the original Trans-Lake Washington Study. He feels it is one of the most valuable options, and that WSDOT

did not reasonably estimate the cost of the condemnations along the corridor, one of the primary reasons it was rejected.

## **PROPOSED TDM PACKAGE**

John Perlic, Parametrix, reviewed the transportation demand management (TDM) package being used in the modeling of the multi-modal alternatives. He reminded the committee that TDM is one of the three major components of the multi-modal packages, as recommended by the Trans-Lake Study Committee. He outlined the goals and objectives of the TDM program, noting that the non-commute trips are very important.

John reviewed the elements of the TDM program, noting that some are targeted for different objectives. One of the elements is a push for vanpools, as a WSDOT-OUM study has demonstrated a large market for vanpools in the region. Public information strategies would include real-time transit and highway information. TDM-supportive facilities will also be needed, such as park and rides, shuttles, and increased transit circulators.

The next steps for the TDM program include analyzing the effectiveness of the elements, identifying additional resources, and suggesting programs across sub-areas and specific implementation steps within those areas. Discussion noted the following:

- Paul Demetriades, City of Medina, asked if the University of Washington UPASS TDM program was being looked at in detail. John Perlic stated that it is an excellent model, and that the data are being used and the team is working with Peter Dewey of UW. It was suggested that Peter Dewey brief the Executive Committee before the results of the multi-modal analysis.
- A question about incentives to shifting freight trips to off-peak hours was asked. John Perlic said it will be looked at, while noting that the peak hours periods are widening, and may eventually merge.
- A question was raised about what the effectiveness percentage was compared against. John Perlic stated that the comparisons are percent reductions against a baseline of a no action alternative under the current CTR programs. He also stated that the information is pertinent to a single category or element only, and that the reductions are not additive.
- Do the costs of pricing options include employer subsidies? John Perlic stated that those costs are borne by employers, and included in the employer-based strategies.
- There was a question about the percentage of trips that are strictly recreational and the percentage that directly enhance the economy. After a quick discussion, it was noted that the “recreational trips” also invariably add value to the economy in the form of purchases and other exchanges of cash. Work trips do represent 88% of the trips in the morning peak hours period, and 68% in the afternoon based on the Trans-Lake Study origin-destination survey.

- The percentage estimates in volume reductions are based on both real estimates and guesses, depending on the data that are available. Pricing and tolls, for example, have little data from this region, and are therefore educated guesses based on experience elsewhere.

Pat Serie noted that the committee will need more time to discuss the TDM options.

## **OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED MULTI-MODAL ALTERNATIVES**

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, presented the proposed multi-modal alternatives and the input received from the Advisory and Technical Committees. He reviewed the overall process, stating that the modal analysis allowed an understanding of the contributions, effects, and costs from each of the individual modal elements. That information was presented in February, and the discussion will focus on the proposed combinations of those modal alternatives into multi-modal alternatives to move forward. The committee will be asked for a recommendation to the lead agencies on the proposed multi-modal alternatives.

Jeff stated that these multi-modal alternatives do not commit specific design elements such as terminations and interchanges. Assumptions are made about some of the elements for the modeling runs, and these should be representative of how each would perform. After determining the options that pass second level screening, options for each of the alternatives such as interchanges will be revisited.

Jeff reviewed the modal alternatives that were considered:

- No Action
- Minimum footprint
- 1 HOV lane in each direction
- 1 HOV lane and 1 GP in each direction
- Bus only lanes
- Fixed guideway HCT in SR 520
- Bus rapid transit in SR 520 (sep facility)
- HCT on I-90
- HCT at mid lake crossing.

Modal findings for HCT alternatives have shown that:

- I-90 HCT would have the lowest cost and least environmental impacts
- SR 520 HCT avoids I-90 displacement and appears to generate higher intra-Seattle ridership
- Mid-lake crossing does not generate higher ridership, is costly and tech has high risks
- BRT alternatives have cost and ridership similar to fixed guideway alternatives – costs may be reduced by combining it with HOV lanes.

Modal findings for highway alternatives have shown that:

- The No Action alternative should be redefined, since the original definition would require significant construction beyond the scope of the maintenance and operations as required for the EIS.
- Minimum footprint requires replacement of the floating bridge and seismically deficient structures that necessitates realignment from Portage Bay to the east shore of Lake Washington.
- A new alternative is needed, dubbed the safety and preservation alternative; that includes full design standards along the corridor.
- Bus-only lanes significantly under-perform HOV lane at same basic cost.

Jeff Peacock then reviewed the eight proposed multi-modal alternatives that are recommended to be taken through second level screening. He emphasized that each of the alternatives has provisions for mitigation and community enhancement.

Discussion of the multi-modal alternatives raised the following points:

- It would be useful to have a picture of the straightened alignment across the lake, to see how that is necessitated by geography. It will also have a bearing on how the alternatives are viewed.

Jeff Peacock stated that the realignment would begin at the west end of the Portage Bay viaduct, displacing portions of the NOAA, NMFS, and Museum of History and Industry facilities. The advantages include removing curves to increase safety, and allow construction to take place simultaneously with operation of the existing facility. Realignment of the facility is assumed for alternatives 2 – 8. Issues with realignment are prevalent and exacerbated as the facility increases in width.

- How do additional costs of realignment figure into the picture?
- Realignment location on the east shore of Lake Washington and whether the east high rise will be rebuilt is not yet determined. That information will be critical for developing east side opinions.
- Why are the I-90 HCT options limited to light rail, and not including BRT? The Sound Transit long range vision calls for light rail. The service concepts are very similar. Don Billen, Sound Transit, stated that multi-modal alternative 8 would have BRT on I-90 through implementation of current Regional Express projects in the I-90 corridor.
- Alternatives 7 and 8 are on the table to determine how the lanes in each of the alternatives terminate in each direction, as well as to test the level of bus ridership in the SR 520 corridor without light rail in the I-90 corridor.
- Jeff Peacock stated that though the specificity on details such as interchanges is still being developed, the process is trying to determine the big picture for the corridor. Once the recommendation for EIS alternatives is made in June, the process will take a step back to look at the range of options for interchanges, for example, and determine which works best.

- There was a suggestion that freight traffic be relegated to the I-90 corridor. State and federal funds prohibit such restrictions.
- HCT should not be slated for the I-90 corridor in the alternatives, since the money for full HOV on I-90 is not available, and it diminishes the need for HCT on SR 520. Jeff Peacock stated that it is important to look at both options in the alternatives, in order to compare the options and not predetermine the decision.
- There is still consideration of HCT above or below grade, though communities have not been receptive to it.
- The differences between alternatives 3 and 7, and 4 and 8, include connections, cost and performance.
- All HOV lanes on SR 520 are assumed to be 3+, since the anticipated level of use at 2+ would result in too much congestion.

Jeff Peacock reviewed the modal alternatives that are not suggested to move forward:

1. Minimum footprint
2. Bus only lanes
3. Mid lake crossing
4. Pure BRT alternative

Jeff reviewed the input from the Advisory and Technical Committees, as well as the schedule for presenting the results over the next two months. Intra-Seattle issues were raised about the necessity of this project to look at an HCT route that serves downtown Seattle via a different loop than the Link light rail.

## **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON PROPOSED MULTI-MODAL ALTERNATIVES**

It was suggested that the alternatives be reviewed one at a time, with decisions made on them to carry them forward by consensus.

### **Dropped modal options**

The modal alternatives that were not included in the multi-modal alternatives are:

1. Minimum footprint
2. Bus only lanes
3. Mid lake crossing
4. Pure BRT alternative

There were no objections to dropping these options, and the recommendation was affirmed by consensus.

### **Alternative 1 – No Action**

There was some discussion about why the no action alternative will be included though it does not present a realistic possibility for the corridor. The team responded that it is necessary to legally fulfill the NEPA process.

There were no objections to carrying Alternative 1, and the recommendation was affirmed by consensus.

### **Alternative 2 – Safety and Preservation, I-90 LRT**

There was discussion about the change in alignment in this alternative and all remaining alternatives. Jeff Peacock stated that it makes the most sense to move the roadway to the north by a distance ranging from 75 to 200 feet, determined by the width of the new bridge. Discussions with the community and affected buildings have been open.

A comment was also made that the Safety and Preservation alternative doesn't do much for improving transportation across the bridge, and therefore fails to address the primary problem.

There were no objections to carrying Alternative 2, and the recommendation was affirmed by consensus.

### **Alternative 3 – SR 520 HOV, I-90 LRT**

There were no objections to carrying Alternative 3, and the recommendation was affirmed by consensus.

### **Alternative 4 – SR 520 HOV, GP, I-90 LRT**

Richard Conlin noted that the Seattle City Council had passed a resolution stating that Seattle will not accept more general purpose capacity into the city. The east side is interested in creating additional GP. He stated a concern, however, that if it is not studied, the assumptions of both sides will not be able to be tested.

A comment was made that if general purpose lanes do not work because of limited capacity on connecting facilities, it will have a significant effect on the local neighborhoods as traffic peels off into them. Jeff Peacock stated that the analysis will demonstrate the effects in the neighborhoods. Provisions are included for terminating GP lanes on the west side, with possible termination points being Montlake and I-5.

A question was raised about the difference in shoulder widths for each of the alternatives. Jeff Peacock explained the standards of increasing left shoulder widths for greater than two lanes of traffic.

Objections were raised by Rosemarie Ives, City of Redmond, and Richard McIver, City of Seattle, to increasing GP capacity on SR 520. Alternative 4 was affirmed, with the noted objections.

### **Alternative 5 – SR 520 HOV, SR 520 HCT**

There were no objections to carrying Alternative 5, and the recommendation was affirmed by consensus.

### **Alternative 6 - SR 520 HOV, GP, SR 520 HCT**

A question about double-decking lanes was raised. Jeff Peacock stated that it is still being considered, but that the graphic illustrates the width of the lanes as if they were placed at grade.

A question was raised about how the team would address rail across a bridge.

Objections were raised by Rosemarie Ives, City of Redmond, and Richard McIver, City of Seattle, to increasing GP capacity on SR 520. Alternative 6 was affirmed, with the noted objections.

### **Alternative 7 – SR 520 HOV with BRT Connections**

A question was raised about how HOV and BRT would work together. Jeff Peacock explained the concept of the extra 4-foot barrier separation for the HOV lane for safety and performance considerations.

It was noted that the Bellevue Way and 108<sup>th</sup> Street interchanges on the east side are critical to local traffic flow. Jeff Peacock stated that the traffic volumes and impacts will be looked at by June.

There were no objections to carrying Alternative 7, and the recommendation was affirmed by consensus.

### **Alternative 8 – SR 520 HOV with BRT Connections, GP**

Objections were raised by Rosemarie Ives, City of Redmond, and Richard McIver, City of Seattle, to increasing GP capacity on SR 520. Alternative 8 was affirmed, with the noted objections.

Pat Serie opened the discussion to consider additions to this set of multi-modal alternatives. None were raised.

A question was raised about the feasibility of alternatives 5 and 6 in terms of cost. Aubrey Davis, Chair, Washington Transportation Commission, stated that it depends on the regional financing that will be brought forward to the project.

There was also discussion of the process beyond the selection of the alternatives to evaluate in the EIS. Jeff Peacock stated that he anticipates the no action and safety and preservation alternatives to be carried forward, along with one or two others. The EIS process will determine the final preferred alternative. There was concern expressed that the information available by June will not be sufficient to make choices for the alternatives. Jeff Peacock assured the group that the estimates on costs, impacts, and effects on the transportation system will be available, and that the adopted criteria will guide the second-level screening process. Each alternative will

include an enhancement and mitigation package. Richard Conlin, City of Seattle, stated that this information will be important to be able to make decisions.

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION FINANCING**

Dave Dye, WSDOT, led a discussion about regional transportation financing. He stated that WSDOT is currently putting budgets together and assembling a list of priority projects. WSDOT has been deluged with questions about many projects including Trans-Lake. There are questions about how much is needed, and what could be done with a given amount of money. Since there will not be enough funding available to work on all the projects, it leads to a question of staging and phasing in projects. Conversations have shown that there would be anywhere from \$700 million to \$1.3 billion available. The department has stated that at least a \$1.2 –1.3 billion placeholder is needed to work on the safety and preservation alternative.

A similar discussion has been held around the I-405 study. The Executive Committee on that project has created a subcommittee to take an active role on working on funding for that project, including introducing congestion pricing on a corridor or regional level. He asked if the Trans-Lake Executive Committee would like to create a similar committee, and if so, how it might be done.

Aubrey Davis stated that the I-405 project is working with legislators on how to build the I-405 project in 10 or 20 years. If a large amount of money is slated for I-405, then there may be implications for Trans-Lake.

It was generally agreed that members would be interested in creating a financing subcommittee to determine some of the options and possibilities for the Trans-Lake Project. Volunteers included Cynthia Sullivan, King County; Daryl Grigsby, City of Seattle; Phil Noble, City of Bellevue; Rob McKenna, King County; Jack Crawford, Sound Transit; Fred McConkey, Town of Hunts Point; Bryan Cairns, City of Mercer Island; Ed Switaj, City of Seattle; and Dave Earling, Sound Transit.

Dave Earling, Sound Transit, asked whether the question of financing warrants a broader discussion for the region. One or two projects driving the decision making in the region doesn't make a lot of sense in the long term. Dave Earling stated that the project should not result in a band-aid on the bridge because of a lack of a funding. It would be a waste of the project time.

Rob McKenna, King County, spoke in favor of forming a committee. He stated that the I-405 committee is able to push back on the legislature for funding. The I-405 project is looking to complete the \$7.1 billion project in 10 years. It was helpful for the state to see how it might be packaged, to break down the smaller projects to show where the money comes from to become more manageable.

Dave Dye stated that he will be working with the subcommittee immediately to get it up and running.



## **MEETING HANDOUTS**

- Agenda
- Proposed Multi-Modal Alternatives, graphics, Committee Discussion Draft, April 25, 2001
- Proposed Executive Committee Multi-Modal Alternative Recommendation, presentation, April 25, 2001
- Draft TDM Element of Multimodal Alternatives, Presentation, April 2001
- Highway Modal Evaluation, Report, April 10, 2001
- HCT Modal Evaluation, Report, April 10, 2001
- Input from Advisory and Technical Committees on Proposed Multi-modal Alternatives, April 17 and 18, 2001
- Response to Questions and Issues form Executive, Technical and Advisory Committee Members, April 17, 2001

### **Public Comment Submitted**

- Letter from Daniel J. Bray, concerning Seismic Risk/Vulnerability of the SR-520 Corridor, April 22, 2001
- TRUST Resolution 00-02, April 25, 2001

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- Add reference to the shoulders in the descriptions (ACTION)
- Put realignment as bullet point on all the alts (ACTION)
- Widths of the jersey barriers should be looked at in relation to other types of areas. (Action)
- Should re-title alternatives 7 and 8 to show difference that is the direct connections to DT Seattle.
- Create aerial photo of alignment for next workshops.

## **MEETING ATTENDEES**

### ***Executive Committee Members***

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>		<b>Organization</b>
	Becker	Daniel	City of Medina
X	Berry	Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
X	Cairns	Bryan	City of Mercer Island
X	Conlin	Richard	City of Seattle
X	Crawford	Jack	Sound Transit Board
X	Davis	Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Earling	Dave	Sound Transit Board
	Edwards	Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Fong	Gene	Federal Highway Administration
X	Ganz	Nona	City of Kirkland
	Gehrke	Linda	Federal Transit Administration
X	Grigsby	Daryl	City of Seattle

	Horn	Jim	Washington State Senate
X	Ives	Rosemarie	City of Redmond
	Jacobsen	Ken	Washington State Senate
X	Marshall	Connie	City of Bellevue
X	Martin	George	City of Clyde Hill
X	McConkey	Fred	Town of Hunts Point
X	McIver	Richard	City of Seattle
X	McKenna	Rob	King County Council
	Murray	Ed	WA State House of Representatives
X	Noble	Phil	City of Bellevue
	Okamoto	John	WSDOT - NW Region
	Pflug	Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
X	Sullivan	Cynthia	King County Council
X	Taniguchi	Harold	King County Department of Transportation
	Wills	Heidi	City of Seattle

### *Executive Committee Alternates*

<b>Present</b>	<b>Name</b>		<b>Organization</b>
	Asher	David	City of Kirkland
	Bowman	Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Drais	Dan	FTA
	Carpenter	Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	McKenzie	Jack	Town of Hunts Point
	Creighton	Mike	City of Bellevue
X	Demitriades	Paul	City of Medina
X	Dye	Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
	Fimia	Maggi	Puget Sound Regional Council / King County Council
	Hague	Jane	King County Council
X	Hughes	Gary	Federal Highway Administration
	Jahncke	El	City of Mercer Island
	Conrad	Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis	George	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Paine	Thomas	City of Redmond
	Rourke	Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge	Steve	City of Yarrow Point
X	Switaj	Ed	City of Seattle
	White	Bob	Sound Transit

### *Other attendees*

John Hansen, Seattel  
 Omar Fulton, AMEC/SubTerra  
 Dave Elliot, Bellevue Transportation  
 Henry Paulman, TRUST  
 Daniel Bray, Bellevue  
 Wiley Brooks, Medina  
 Mitch Wasserman, City of Clyde Hill  
 Terry Marpert, City of Redmond  
 Tom Cossette, HNTB Corp, Inc

Janet Mida  
Jean Lead, Montlake  
Virginia Gunby, 1000 Friends of Washington  
Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue  
Bernard Van de Kamp, City of Bellevue  
Andrew Schmid, King County  
Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT

*Project Team*

Les Rubstello, WSDOT  
Rob Fellows, WSDOT  
Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit  
Don Billen, Sound Transit  
Jeff Peacock, Parametrix  
Daryl Wendle, Parametrix  
Lindsay Yamane, Parametrix  
Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill  
Anne Sienko, CH2M Hill  
Pat Serie, EnviroIssues  
Amy Grotefendt, EnviroIssues  
Paul Hezel, EnviroIssues

PJH